

SOUTH DAVIS COUNTY TRANSIT DEIS

Salt Lake City Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3 - Summary

Project:

South Davis County Transit DEIS

Meeting Purpose:

Salt Lake City Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3

Meeting

9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

August 22, 2007

Location:

City and County Building, room 118

Attendee

Angelo Papastamos

Kerry Doane

Kim Clark

Jacqueline Jensen

Saffron Capson

Colleen Lavery

Robin Hutcheson

Polly Hart

Rex Harris

Janneke House (representative)

Dorothy Barlow

James Williamson

Roger Borgenicht

Representing

UDOT

UTA

VIA

H.W. Lochner

H.W. Lochner

Carter & Burgess

Fehr & Peers

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Meeting Summary:**Process**

K. Clark began by explaining where the project currently is in the overall process. She indicated alternatives for the project are currently being evaluated. Input from the next round of sub-committee meetings will be used to accomplish this task. During the next regional workshop attendees will focus specifically on alignments. During the current meeting the focus will be on alternative modes. The Purpose and Need Statement for the study was reviewed with the group. Sub-committee members were referred to their meeting packets for full text copies of all of the meeting materials..

Regional Workshop Recap

K. Clark recapped the exercise conducted at the second Regional Workshop which focused on origins/destinations, alignments, and the identification of modes. A map of the primary and secondary alignments identified at the Regional Workshop was shown to the group.

Universe of Alternatives

K. Clark explained what the “universe of alternatives” entailed and the Universe of Alignments map was shown. Sub-committee members were then taken through the two components to an alternative (alignment and mode).

Alignments

A map of preliminary alignments being taken through the alternatives analysis process was shown to sub-committee members as the study’s preliminary “long list alignments.” K. Clark reviewed the criteria used to narrow down alignments.

Modes

Next, a “universe of modes” list was reviewed with the sub-committee members. As with alignment narrowing criteria, mode narrowing criteria was discussed. The preliminary “long list of modes” was outlined by K. Clark. The list was divided into two categories – bus and rail.

Factors to Consider

K. Clark defined factors to consider when comparing modes. Factors included market, capacity, operating characteristics, costs, environmental/community considerations, and access. After each factor was reviewed, a “dot game” exercise was conducted to determine which three factors are most important to each sub-committee member in considering modes. The following is a list of factors identified by the Salt Lake City sub-committee members as most important when considering modes:

Category	Factors	Number of Dots
Market	Local trips are important.	1
	Commuter trips are important.	1
Capacity		0
Operating Characteristics	It should stop frequently.	0
	Reliability (added by sub-committee members)	3
	Minimal travel time.	0
Costs		0
Environmental/Community Considerations	It needs to sit within the context of my community.	3
	It needs to allow for good traffic flow.	0
Access	It needs to be easy to board.	0
	I need to be able to get to it easily.	0

Long List Modes

R. Hutcheson outlined each mode in the preliminary long list of modes, including giving a description and typical characteristics based on how the mode has been implemented in other communities in the United States. After each mode was discussed, the group participated in an exercise to determine the “pros” and “cons” of implementing each mode in their community. Below is a list of pros and cons identified by Salt Lake City sub-committee members.

BUS (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Buses in HOV lanes are competitive with auto travel	Older buses have limited number of bike racks
Well suited for short trips	Not viewed as convenient mode over long distances (time consuming)
Buses serve residential areas well	

BRT – Bus Rapid Transit (3 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Lower cost	Risk of loss of auto capacity without alternative roads (BRT dedicated)
Flexibility of energy source	Lower capacity vs. other modes (no capacity for special events)
Works with densities (high/low)	Unpredictability (routes can change)
Flexibility of routes	

LRT – Light Rail Transit (2 Dots)	
Pro	Con
“Fixity” = changes in land use = walkability (long term benefit)	Risk of loss of auto capacity without alternative roads
Fixed routes can have long term land use effects. Developers know where to make investment.	Inflexible (fixed route)
Connectivity to existing LRT network	Walkability is impacted
Quiet and clean air	Awkward to take bikes on light rail
Flexibility and capacity (ability to expand for special events)	In the short term, it impacts your walkability (before T.O.D)

Streetcar (0Dots)	
Pro	Con
Ties to SLC master plan	Can't serve downtown areas as easily as a bus
Access more points in SLC	Restricted by power source (not flexible)
Local service	
Historic and therefore charming	
Cost when compared with LRT	

DMU – Diesel Mobile Unit (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Serves commuter traffic	Increased fumes (impact to air quality)
Speed	West side service (does not serve east side needs)
Cost	
Serves “the hub”	

Notes: During the exercise ideas were expressed regarding the importance of Davis County input. It was stated those six sub-committees should defiantly identify what is important. Reliability was brought up as an important operating characteristic.

Future Meetings

The next sub-committee meeting will be held on October 17th from 9:00–11:00 a.m.

Any discrepancies with this meeting summary, please notify Jacqueline Jensen.

Cc: Attendees, Project Contact List, Salt Lake City Sub-Committee Members

